



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,068	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-48400	6894
58467	7590	02/22/2008		
MHKKG/SUN P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/556,068	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ALLAVARPU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Haresh Patel	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: 61-63.  
 Claim(s) objected to: None.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-60.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Haresh Patel/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the cited prior arts still render the claims unpatentable and the final rejection dated 11/28/07 is deemed proper. Regarding the applicant's concern regarding the double patenting rejection, i.e., the Examiner's failure to address each difference of each claim of the present application compared to the claims of the other applications, please see the prosecution history in which the difference is in fact relied upon different art and the motivation to combine the teachings has been also provided. Regarding the differences for the double patenting rejections what also matters is that reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating the double patenting rejection. In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the wording of the claims are. In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The applicant's conveniently made assertions, i.e., the examiner is incorrect, etc., is improper because the rejections are indeed based on the cited references. The applicant is requested that mere arguments do not overcome the rejections as the rejections are based on the cited references and the MPEP laws, please see the office actions of the prosecution history. Considering the prosecution of this case, i.e., maintaining of the positions and the office actions of the case, again what the MPEP suggests is, i.e., MPEP 1201 states: Where the differences of opinion concern the denial of patent claims because of prior art or other patentability issues, the questions thereby raised are said to relate to the merits, and appeal procedure within the Office and to the courts has long been provided by statute (35 USC 143). 35 U.S.C. 134 (a) states: An applicant for a patent, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the primary examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, having once paid the fee for such appeal. The applicant to present, nrol. The fact that Barry teaches a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with services provided by remote servers has absolutely no relevance to object-level access control, Barker teaches away from object-level access control, etc., statements are irrelevant.

The applicant failed to consider the examiner's explanation, i.e., to consider its own response for the limitations, i.e., Just because a manager is coupled to a gateway that in turn is coupled to a managed object does not imply that the manager is automatically or inherently interfacing, or cannot be prevented from interfacing, with the managed object. According to the Examiner's logic, every PC connected (coupled) to the Internet is interfacing with every other PC concurrently connected (coupled) to the Internet. Similarly, following the Examiner's logic, since a firewall device coupled between a home PC and the Internet implies the firewall device would be unable to prevent a malicious PC from interfacing with the home PC". Applicant's statement, "Barry teaches a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with the services provided by remote servers has absolutely no relevance to object-level access control", "Barker teaches away from object-level access control", is simply misleading and/or irrelevant as none of the office actions relies on it and the applicant fails to consider its own arguments, i.e., Just because a manager is coupled to a gateway that in turn is coupled to a managed object does not imply that the manager is automatically or inherently interfacing, or cannot be prevented from interfacing, with the managed object. According to the Examiner's logic, every PC connected (coupled) to the Internet is interfacing with every other PC concurrently connected (coupled) to the Internet. Similarly, following the Examiner's logic, since a firewall device coupled between a home PC and the Internet implies the firewall device would be unable to prevent a malicious PC from interfacing with the home PC". Therefore, rejection of the claims is maintained. Regarding the applicant's concern about the limitations "object-level access control at an individual object level", Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See In re Wilder, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). In fact the specification contains, "The Request Gateway may provide object-level access control between manager applications and managed objects in that manager application access to managed objects may be granted at the individual object level by use of a Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP). In this way user information may be included with each request sent to a managed object through the MIS. The MIS may then use this (user) information to determine whether the user has access to that particular object. In one embodiment, the MIS may check the user ID against an authentication list or table which contains user/object access information. A regular application Service Access Point (SAP) does not allow the insertion of the user information in the request message to enforce object-level access control, and therefore a request SAP is recommended to send PMI requests and receive PMI responses with appropriate object-level access control enforced". Regarding, the statement, "the fact that Barry teaches a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with services provided by remote servers has absolutely no relevance to object-level access control", "the examiner's position is completely unsupported by the teachings of the cited art", concern regarding the combination of teachings, barker teaches away from object-level access control, the examiner is incorrectly assuming, when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977). It is well established that a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references based on a reason, suggestion or motivation to lead an inventor to combine those references. In re Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastic Inc., 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972). There is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2d 1300, 1302 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); In re

Young, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Please refer to the below rejections for the claims. Regarding the applicant's concern that the limitations, object corresponding to a telephone network and providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object is not well known in the art, Reisman, 6,769,009, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, cols., 26-30. Reed, 6,757,710, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, col., 17 - 21. Arango et al., 6,724,747, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, cols., 3 - 5. Kung et al., 7,120,139, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, cols., 4-6. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, "Barker et al. U.S. patent number 6,363,421 (Herein after Barker) does not anticipate a gateway that is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects, wherein said object-level access control is provided at the individual object level so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches a gateway (e.g., an element management server, figure 1A), that is configurable to provide object-level access control (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements, figure 6) between the managers (e.g., software modules accessing network elements, figures 3 and 4) and the managed objects (e.g., network elements, figure 1C, abstract), wherein said object-level access control is provided at the individual object level so that one of the managers (e.g., software modules accessing network elements, figures 3 and 4) is granted access to one of the managed objects (e.g., network elements, figure 1C, abstract) while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements, figure 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed below. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker does not teach object-level access control". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches an object-level access control (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements, figure 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed below. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker does not teach a client presenting a user name, password or other authentication credentials when registering for object attribute update notification". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies "a client presenting a user name, password or other authentication credentials when registering for object attribute update notification" are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is "an object-level access control". Barker very clearly teaches an object-level access control (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements, figure 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker does not teach object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches an object-level access control (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements, figure 6) between the managers (e.g., software modules accessing network elements, figures 3 and 4) and the managed objects (e.g., network elements, figure 1C, abstract). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed below. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker fails to anticipate determining on a managed object level whether or not the manager application is allowed to send a request to the managed object. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches determining on a managed object level whether or not the manager application is allowed to send a request to the managed object (e.g., use of managed object identifier for network elements in the requests, figure 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed below. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker fails to teach wherein the gateway is configurable to determine whether each of the managers is authorized to communicate with each of the managed objects". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches the gateway (e.g., an element management server, figure 1A) is configurable to determine whether each of the managers (e.g., software modules accessing network elements, figures 3 and 4) is authorized to communicate (e.g., user session, figure 6) with each of the managed objects (e.g., network elements, figure 1C, abstract). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker fails to teach a gateway that is configurable to authenticate the managers to receive the events from or to send the request to the managed objects as a function of the identity of the managed objects". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches a gateway (e.g., an element management server, figure 1A) that is configurable to authenticate (e.g., figure 6) the managers (e.g., software modules accessing network elements, figures 3 and 4) to receive the events from or to send the request to the managed objects as a function of the identity of the managed objects (e.g., notification, figure 6). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states "variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, "Barker does not teach wherein the managed objects comprise one or more objects corresponding to a telephone network. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches the managed objects comprise one or more objects corresponding to a telephone network (e.g., figure 1A, network element of public switched telephone network, also corresponding is a broad term meaning - be in contact, in touch,

communicate). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states “variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, “Barker does not teach a gateway that is configurable to provide security audit trails comprising the gateway providing access to a logging service”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches a gateway that is configurable to provide security audit trails comprising the gateway providing access to a logging service (e.g., use of storage devices to store filtered / audited and events information, col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states “variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, “Barker does not teach the logging service, local data services at the server, is operable to log an ID of a user that sends each request”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies “the logging service, local data services at the server, is operable to log an ID of a user that sends each request” are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is “the logging service is operable to log an ID of a user that sends each request”. Barker very clearly teaches the logging service is operable to log an ID of a user that sends each request (e.g., ID of an agent application associated with a particular user request, col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53). Therefore the rejection is maintained as disclosed above. Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states “variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Applicant argues, “Barker does not teach that the requests are converted from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format / Portable Management Interface (PMD format prior to delivery to the managed objects”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Barker very clearly teaches that the requests are converted from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format / Portable Management Interface (PMD format prior to delivery to the managed objects (e.g., conversion from the IDL to a network element specific protocol, the specific protocol used for communication with the network element is specified by the service object, other managed object classes could be added that utilize a different protocol and encapsulate that knowledge in the managed object class, hence any protocol, like PMI can be supported, col., 21, line 46 – col., 22, line 59). Also, Page 46 of the specification, i.e., enclosed disclosure, clearly states “variations, modifications, additions and improvements may fall within the scope of the invention as detailed within the claims”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, Barker meets the claimed limitations. Regarding the *Vuong* also the applicant conveniently concluded irrelevant disclosure but the disclosure of the *Vuong* is not limited as asserted by the applicant as *Vuong* also discloses a plurality of managed objects and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), and a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col., 2, lines 1 – 26), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col., 4, lines 40 – 67); wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), between the managers and the managed objects to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 5, lines 4 – 27), determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application (e.g., col., 8, lines 21 – 42); whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26) and the usage of request SAP (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), individual object level and access control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59). Similarly the applicant conveniently concluded irrelevant disclosure of the *Spencer* but the disclosure of the *Spencer* is not limited as asserted by the applicant as *Spencer* also discloses a gateway which is coupled to a plurality of managed objects and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), and a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col., 2, lines 1 – 26), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col., 4, lines 40 – 67); wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), between the managers and the managed objects to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 5, lines 4 – 27), determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application (e.g., col., 8, lines 21 – 42); whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), and the usage of request SAP (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), individual object level and access control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59), so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 – 59). Please see the office actions of the prosecution history, which is incorporated as it already contains responses to the applicant's concern, which the applicant believes are not addressed or properly addressed. Again the applicant is requested to consider the well known teachings of gateway and firewall etc., (based on the cited references) and in fact when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a

rejection. In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977).